



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1050
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/007,121

10/26/2001

Petr Peterka

018926-006510US

2113

20350

7590

12/14/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/007,121	Applicant(s) PETERKA ET AL.	
	Examiner Carl Colin	Art Unit 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>see att</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In response to communications filed on 9/21/2005, applicant amends claims 1, 14, 17, 21, and 23-25. The following claims 1-26 are presented for examination.

1.1 In response to communications filed on 9/21/2005, the objection of claim 24 has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

1.2 Applicant's remarks, pages 8-15, filed on 9/21/2005 have been considered but they are not persuasive as amended. Applicant argues that Grimes does not disclose an origin server for providing program content and a cache server for storing a copy of content distributed by the origin server as amended. Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, Grimes discloses a plurality of servers (page 3, paragraph 31) and some servers can be used as secondary storage or back up or redundant servers for storing information about the content delivery system to prevent downtime, the invention is not limited to only one DRM server and may comprise additional components (page 3, paragraphs 31, 33, and 36), also the servers may have similar or same hardware components, which means that any of the servers are adapted to perform authentication as the DRM server (page 3, paragraph 31). Grimes' invention is not limited to having any server distributing the content as explained below. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a DRM server may store a copy of the content provided by an origin server without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention disclosed by Grimes. Applicant has amended the claims to further limit the claimed invention. Upon further consideration, claims 1-15, 18, and 23 are now

rejected under 103 in view of Grimes and claims 16-17, 19-22 and 24-26 in view of Grimes and Press.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.1 **Claims 1-15, 18, and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication US 2002/0002674 to **Grimes et al.**

As per claims 1, 4, 6, 10, and 23, Grimes et al discloses a method for distributing program content in a network, comprising a client operable for communicating with any of the servers across said network, (page 3, paragraph 29); and a plurality of servers (page 3, paragraph 31) and some servers can be used as secondary storage or back up or redundant servers for storing information about the content delivery system to prevent downtime, the invention is not limited to only one DRM server and may comprise additional components (page 3, paragraphs

Art Unit: 2136

31, 33, and 36), also the servers may have similar or same hardware components, which means that any of the servers are adapted to perform authentication as the DRM server (page 3, paragraph 31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have redundant and backup servers for storing copy of the program content distributed by one of the servers of the NOC. This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to prevent downtime thereby providing back up of content and load balancing as suggested by Grimes et al (see page 4, paragraphs 31, 33, and 36).

Grimes et al discloses establishing a rule defining whether a client is entitled to receive the program content (page 5, paragraph 44); storing said rule on said network (page 5, paragraphs 44-45); allowing said client to request said program content from a DRM server or a different server than the DRM that meets the recitation of origin server (page 4, paragraphs 39-41). **Grimes et al** discloses using a DRM server (caching server) comprising a hardware profile or pc profile to compare rule to a record describing at least one entitlement characteristic of said client wherein at least one entitlement characteristic comprises data for use by the caching server to authenticate the client so as to determine whether said client is entitled to receive said program content (page 4, paragraphs 39-42) before distributing a key to said client for decrypting said program content (page 5, paragraph 48); wherein the DRM server stores a copy of the program content originally provided to the network by the origin server as explained above, and further discloses multicasting said program content through use of said caching server (page 5, paragraph 47).

As per claims 2-3, Grimes et al discloses the limitation of wherein said rule is comprised of a method of payment and discloses wherein said rule is comprised of a subscription identifier (page 5, paragraph 44).

As per claim 5, Grimes et al discloses the limitation of wherein said rule is comprised of a restriction based on a content rating for a user (page 4, paragraph 44).

As per claim 7, Grimes et al discloses using program ID that determines information indicating at least one service subscribed to by said client (page 4, paragraph 44).

As per claim 8, Grimes et al discloses using certificate that meets the recitation of wherein said at least one entitlement characteristic comprises data for use in authenticating said client with said caching server (page 4, paragraphs 43-44 and page 5, paragraph 48).

As per claim 9, Grimes et al discloses using profile that meets the recitation of wherein said at least one entitlement characteristic is stored by said client in a ticket (page paragraph 42).

As per claims 11-12, Grimes et al discloses further comprising encrypting said at least one entitlement characteristic so as to prevent said client from altering said at least one entitlement characteristic (page 5, paragraph 49).

As per claim 13, Grimes et al discloses the limitation of wherein said multicasting said program content is begun before said comparing said rule to said record (page 5, paragraph 47).

Claim 14 is similar to claim 1 but has broader limitation, claim 14 does not contain the using step, but contains formatting a data record comprising an identifier to identify said program content and said rule for said program content. Grimes et al discloses formatting a profile comprising program ID and program type to identify the rule and program content and a digital certificate including the program ID (page 5, paragraph 44). Therefore, claim 14 is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1.

As per claims 15 and 18, Grimes et al discloses the limitation of authenticating said data record and conveying said data record to said client (page 5, paragraph 41).

3. **Claims 16-17, 19-22 and 24-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 2002/0002674 to **Grimes et al** in view of “Secure Transfer of Identity and Privilege Attributes in an Open Systems Environment”; 1991; 0167-4048/91, Elsevier Science Publishers Ltd. By JIM PRESS (*Applicant's Disclosure*).

3.1 **As per claims 16-17 and 19-22, Grimes et al** substantially discloses the claimed method of claim 14. **Grimes et al** discloses the limitation of conveying said program material to said client (page 5, paragraph 44 and 47) and discloses a trusted third party creating an encrypted digital certificate providing a key to the server for certificate validation process; decrypting said

Art Unit: 2136

data record with a key received from a trusted third party, wherein said trusted third party is a trusted third party for said caching server and the origin server server, wherein said receiving said data record for said client comprises: receiving said data record from said client (page 4, paragraphs 41-43 and page 5, paragraphs 45-48). **Grimes et al** discloses conveying an identifier identifying said program content from said client (page 4, paragraph 44 and page 6, paragraph 50) to said caching server **Grimes et al** discloses the use of certificate but is silent about signing the document to be delivered to another party for verification, which is well known in the art of cryptography. **Press** in an analogous art teaches a secure transfer of identity and privilege attributes in an open system environment and proposes the use of cryptography to protect the integrity and confidentiality of privilege attributes certificates. **Press** discloses signing a data record, and conveying the signed data record to the client and further discloses conveying the signed data record from the client to end systems (see pages 120-121); **Press** discloses signing a data record so as to allow another server to authenticate the data record (see page 121, section 4) and further discloses utilizing a trusted third party for providing key to APA server for use in signing the data record and verification key to end-system servers for use in authenticating the data record (see pages 122-124). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cryptographic protocol used in **Grimes et al** to provide a trusted third party for providing key to APA server for use in signing the data record and verification key to end-system servers for use in authenticating the data record. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to recognize some of the many advantages and approaches as suggested by **Press** to implement data protection and authentication between several parties in this disclosure, for instance, one may choose to use

symmetric techniques over asymmetric for faster processes or a hybrid approach; also, using the procedure of a user obtaining a PAC (Privilege Attribute Certificate) from one party and deliver it to another party such as end-systems as evidence of his/her identity and access rights, and a trusted third party for providing keys to the other parties for use in signing and verifying the data record, as explained above, the authenticity of users are verified, integrity of the PAC is verified and replay attacks are prevented (see at least pages 121-124).

As per claims 24-26, the combination of **Grimes et al** and **Press** discloses receiving data record from client and decrypting said data record with a key received from a trusted third party, wherein said trusted third party is a trusted third party for a caching server and other server (origin server) (see **Press** pages 122-124, and **Grimes et al**, page 5, paragraphs 45 and 48, 53). As explained in claim 1 above, **Grimes et al** also discloses plurality of servers and further discloses the content can originate from a DRM server as well as content provider or other servers for example, (see page 3, paragraphs 31, 36, 38-43).

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2136

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4.1 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as the art discloses some of the claimed features of a multicast distribution system.

US Patents: 6,067,623 Blakley, III et al; 5,758,068 Brandt et al.

4.2 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 571-272-3862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2136


system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Carl Colin

Patent Examiner

December 8, 2005



Primary Examiner
AU2131
12/11/05